

**VIA ECF**

The Honorable Arun Subramanian  
United States District Court for the Southern District of New York  
500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 15A  
New York, NY 10007-1312


March 11, 2025

**Re: *United States et al. v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. et al.; 1:24-cv-03973-AS-SLC***

Dear Judge Subramanian:

Defendants failed to preserve text and chat messages, failed to produce text and chat messages as ordered by the Court, and failed to disclose deleted and delayed messages until the United States discovered the issues and repeatedly questioned them. Given these time-sensitive and ongoing concerns, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court order Defendants to respond, by March 18, to the questions in Appendix A—enabling Plaintiffs to quickly assess the scale and scope of these harms, report to the Court, and seek any further remedies that may be required.

**Defendants' Past and Ongoing Failure to Preserve Text Messages**



[REDACTED] Ex. C at 5. Defendants are wrong—it is not enough that they simply issue a legal hold and assume the custodians have complied. See *Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC*, 229 F.R.D. 422, 432 (S.D.N.Y. 2004).

Defendants' preservation failures and piecemeal disclosure have continued into this litigation. On March 6, 2025, Defendants shared that their President of U.S. Concerts, Bob Roux—whom Defendants had never previously raised preservation concerns about—“routinely deleted

text chains.” Ex. D at 9. This disclosure came about only because of Plaintiffs’ persistent inquiries since January, after a third party produced *hundreds of pages* of responsive texts involving Mr. Roux that were not in Defendants’ production. Plaintiffs inquired repeatedly about the missing texts, but Defendants deflected. *Id.* at 20-21. Defendants only admitted last week to wholesale deletion of evidence that should have been preserved. *Id.* at 9.

Defendants’ revelations about Mr. Roux’s routine text deletion are especially concerning because [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]—only to disclose in March 2025 that Mr. Roux routinely deleted text messages, including his copious responsive texts produced by a third party.

Given the circumstances of these deletions and Defendants’ failure to identify and disclose them earlier, Plaintiffs have reason to fear that Mr. Roux’s practice was not unique amongst Live Nation executives subject to a legal hold. Indeed, the third-party production containing Mr. Roux’s deleted texts also contained extensive texts that Defendants never produced involving other Live Nation executives, including priority litigation custodians. Defendants themselves produced other documents that reference responsive, priority text chains that Defendants neither produced nor disclosed might be missing. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] further compounds the need to understand what has happened to this evidence. *See* Ex. C at 5. Plaintiffs need a full review of Defendants’ litigation hold practices to know what other evidence Mr. Roux and any other custodians may have deleted and so request that Defendants be ordered to answer the questions in Appendix A by March 18, and that the Court hold a hearing shortly after.

#### **Defendants’ Failure to Produce Texts and Chats**

Plaintiffs need answers to the questions in Appendix A because—in addition to the deletions—Defendants failed to produce responsive texts and chats before the priority custodian production deadline, as previously discussed in Plaintiffs’ motion to compel. *See* ECF 472. In discovery, Plaintiffs sought—and Defendants agreed to produce—responsive texts and chats from five messaging platforms for largely five- to nine-year timeframes. But to date, Defendants have produced under 20% of their priority custodial texts and chats before the Court’s substantial completion deadline, and over 80% since the deadline lapsed (and more to come without a final deadline). Specifically, before January 15, Defendants produced fewer than 1,300 texts and chats for 25 priority custodians, during the multiyear timeframe, from across five platforms. After that deadline, Defendants belatedly produced over four times the number of priority texts and chats (approximately 5,300 new documents). Once again, Defendants have disclosed these issues only in piecemeal, if at all, and only after repeated and specific questions by Plaintiffs.

Defendants do business via text and chat, using cellphone carrier messaging, Slack, Teams, WhatsApp, and Zoom. Their messages are often more unfiltered than company emails and thus highly probative. *See, e.g.*, Am. Compl. ¶ 92 (Live Nation executive’s veiled threat to venue by text). Yet nearly two months after the Court’s substantial completion deadline, Defendants still have not produced significant tranches of priority texts even though the substantial completion deadline has passed, discovery is over halfway through, and depositions are beginning. Critical texts remain outstanding, including seven months of texts from Live Nation’s Chief Executive Officer and a month of texts from its Chief Financial Officer. As is now typical for Defendants, they did not inform Plaintiffs of these executives’ missing texts until February 20, after repeated questions about Defendants’ surprisingly low text productions that they first ignored and deflected.

It appears that Defendants failed to create and check the document universe at the outset of discovery as required under the TAR Protocol. Before applying search terms or undertaking TAR reviews, Defendants were required to collect and ready the “Overall Universe” of documents for review. ECF 472-2, § II. Instead, over a month after the Court’s deadline, and after pointed questioning, Defendants revealed that many thousands of documents were still being ingested and reviewed, including substantial buckets of texts and chats from specific platforms, people, and time periods. Last week, Defendants shared for the first time that they had found around 9,000 more custodial documents from unspecified sources and files, including an unknown number of texts and chats. As of today, the document universe for primary custodians is still incomplete.

Plaintiffs have been forced to investigate the adequacy of Defendants’ productions, even though this analysis has been hamstrung by Defendants’ irregular text and chat metadata. For example, Defendants initially produced text and chat messages with date fields such that over 44% of Defendants’ messages from five- and nine-year timeframes dated from three, seemingly random, nonconsecutive months. And Defendants’ text and chat custodial fields identified few to no text and chat messages from most priority custodians, including none for Defendants’ Chief Executive Officer. Only after repeated questions from Plaintiffs did Defendants create two corrective metadata overlays, one of which Defendants shared with Plaintiffs.

As the producing party, Defendants bore the burden to create the document universe at the outset of discovery, to quality check it to confirm its scope and comprehensiveness, to disclose affirmatively any gaps or omissions, and to produce responsive documents on the Court-ordered timeline. Defendants have done none of this. Instead, they have forced Plaintiffs to identify specific gaps in the document universe long after the production deadline elapsed and based on Defendants’ ever-evolving late productions. Defendants then often sidestepped Plaintiffs’ efforts to get discovery back on track and resolve these issues. Defendants’ behavior has impeded Plaintiffs’ ability to plan for depositions and delays and distracts resources during the already compressed discovery period. Without Court intervention, these problems are also likely to recur, as Defendants admit that their document universe for non-priority custodians is still incomplete nearly two months after it should have been final. *See ECF 472-2, § VII.*

#### **Plaintiffs’ Proposed Relief**

Defendants were required to “take affirmative steps to monitor compliance” by their litigation hold recipients. *Zubulake*, 229 F.R.D. at 432. They failed to preserve text messages, failed to produce text and chat messages, and failed to affirmatively disclose the destruction and delay. To assess these harms, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter an order requiring Defendants to answer the questions in Appendix A regarding the scope and circumstances of Defendants’ preservation and production deficiencies. Plaintiffs can then report to the Court on this issue at a discovery status conference, and seek any further remedies, as appropriate.

On March 6, Plaintiffs requested a Lead Trial Counsel meet and confer by Monday, March 10. Defendants said they were not available, gave no availability, and after more follow up, said they were not available until Wednesday, March 12 after 3 PM ET, by which time they would provide answers to preservation questions Plaintiffs raised, which constitute some of the questions posed in Appendix A. Given Defendants’ failure to abide by the Court’s Individual Practices, the urgency created by their ongoing potential text deletions, the parties’ ongoing communications regarding the issues, several prior meet and confers since January (including Lead Trial Counsel calls on February 27 and March 5 for 1 hour and 40 minutes that included discussion of this), and the multiple meet-and-confers and communications during the investigation—Plaintiffs declared an impasse on March 11 prior to this filing. Plaintiffs request a separate hearing on this motion.

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ Bonny Sweeney  
BONNY SWEENEY  
*Lead Trial Counsel*

United States Department of Justice  
Antitrust Division  
450 Fifth Street N.W., Suite 4000  
Washington, DC 20530  
Telephone: (202) 725-0165  
Facsimile: (202) 514-7308  
Email: [Bonny.Sweeney@usdoj.gov](mailto:Bonny.Sweeney@usdoj.gov)

*Attorney for Plaintiff United States*

/s/ Robert A. Bernheim

Robert A. Bernheim (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Office of the Arizona Attorney General  
Consumer Protection & Advocacy Section  
2005 N. Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Telephone: (602) 542-3725  
Fax: (602) 542-4377  
Email: [Robert.Bernheim@azag.gov](mailto:Robert.Bernheim@azag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

/s/ Amanda J. Wentz

Amanda J. Wentz (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Arkansas Attorney General  
323 Center Street, Suite 200  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Telephone: (501) 682-1178  
Fax: (501) 682-8118  
Email: [amanda.wentz@arkansasag.gov](mailto:amanda.wentz@arkansasag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Arkansas*

/s/ Paula Lauren Gibson

Paula Lauren Gibson (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Deputy Attorney General  
(CA Bar No. 100780)  
Office of the Attorney General  
California Department of Justice  
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Telephone: (213) 269-6040  
Email: [paula.gibson@doj.ca.gov](mailto:paula.gibson@doj.ca.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of California*

/s/ Conor J. May

Conor J. May (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Antitrust Unit  
Colorado Department of Law  
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: (720) 508-6000  
Email: [Conor.May@coag.gov](mailto:Conor.May@coag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Colorado*

/s/ Kim Carlson McGee

Kim Carlson McGee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General of Connecticut  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Telephone: 860-808-5030  
Email: [kim.mcgee@ct.gov](mailto:kim.mcgee@ct.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Connecticut*

/s/ Elizabeth G. Arthur

Elizabeth G. Arthur (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia  
400 6<sup>th</sup> Street NW, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20001  
Email: [Elizabeth.arthur@dc.gov](mailto:Elizabeth.arthur@dc.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff District of Columbia*

/s/ Lizabeth A. Brady

Lizabeth A. Brady  
Director, Antitrust Division  
Florida Office of the Attorney General  
PL-01 The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050  
Telephone: 850-414-3300  
Email: [Liz.Brady@myfloridalegal.com](mailto:Liz.Brady@myfloridalegal.com)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Florida*

/s/ Richard S. Schultz

Richard S. Schultz (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
Antitrust Bureau  
115 S. LaSalle Street, Floor 23  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Telephone: (872) 272-0996  
Email: [Richard.Schultz@ilag.gov](mailto:Richard.Schultz@ilag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Illinois*

/s/ Jesse Moore

Jesse Moore (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Deputy Attorney General  
Office of the Indiana Attorney General  
302 W. Washington St., Fifth Floor  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
Telephone: 317-232-4956  
Email: [Jesse.Moore@atg.in.gov](mailto:Jesse.Moore@atg.in.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

/s/ Noah Goerlitz

Noah Goerlitz (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Iowa Attorney General  
1305 E. Walnut St.  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
Telephone: (515) 281-5164  
Email: [noah.goerlitz@ag.iowa.gov](mailto:noah.goerlitz@ag.iowa.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Iowa*

/s/ Christopher Teters

Christopher Teters (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Protection Division  
Office of Kansas Attorney General  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612-1597  
Telephone: (785) 296-3751  
Email: [chris.teters@ag.ks.gov](mailto:chris.teters@ag.ks.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Kansas*

/s/ Mario Guadamud

Mario Guadamud (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Louisiana Office of Attorney General  
1885 North Third Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70802  
Telephone: (225) 326-6400  
Fax: (225) 326-6498  
Email: [GuadamudM@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:GuadamudM@ag.louisiana.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Louisiana*

/s/ Schonette J. Walker

Schonette J. Walker (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Chief, Antitrust Division  
200 St. Paul Place, 19th floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202  
Telephone: (410) 576-6470  
Email: [swalker@oag.state.md.us](mailto:swalker@oag.state.md.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Maryland*

/s/ Katherine W. Krems

Katherine W. Krems (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division  
Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 963-2189  
Email: [Katherine.Krems@mass.gov](mailto:Katherine.Krems@mass.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

/s/ LeAnn D. Scott

LeAnn D. Scott (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Corporate Oversight Division  
Michigan Department of Attorney General  
P.O. Box 30736  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Telephone: (517) 335-7632  
Email: [ScottL21@michigan.gov](mailto:ScottL21@michigan.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Michigan*

/s/ Zach Biesanz

Zach Biesanz  
Senior Enforcement Counsel  
Antitrust Division  
Office of the Minnesota Attorney General  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1400  
Saint Paul, MN 55101  
Telephone: (651) 757-1257  
Email: [zach.biesanz@ag.state.mn.us](mailto:zach.biesanz@ag.state.mn.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Minnesota*

/s/ Gerald L. Kucia

Gerald L. Kucia (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
Mississippi Office of Attorney General  
Post Office Box 220  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205  
Telephone: (601) 359-4223  
Email: [Gerald.Kucia@ago.ms.gov](mailto:Gerald.Kucia@ago.ms.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Mississippi*

/s/ Justin C. McCully

Justin C. McCully (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Bureau  
Office of the Nebraska Attorney General  
2115 State Capitol  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Telephone: (402) 471-9305  
Email: [justin.mccully@nebraska.gov](mailto:justin.mccully@nebraska.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Nebraska*

/s/ Lucas J. Tucker

Lucas J. Tucker (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
Bureau of Consumer Protection  
100 N. Carson St.  
Carson City, NV 89701  
Email: [ltucker@ag.nv.gov](mailto:ltucker@ag.nv.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

/s/ Zachary Frish

Zachary A. Frish (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection & Antitrust Bureau  
New Hampshire Attorney General's Office  
Department of Justice  
1 Granite Place South  
Concord, NH 03301  
Telephone: (603) 271-2150  
Email: [zachary.a.frish@doj.nh.gov](mailto:zachary.a.frish@doj.nh.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New Hampshire*

/s/ Yale A. Leber

Yale A. Leber (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Deputy Attorney General  
Division of Law  
Antitrust Litigation and Competition  
Enforcement  
124 Halsey Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Newark, NJ 07101  
Telephone: (973) 648-3070  
Email: [Yale.Leber@law.njoag.gov](mailto:Yale.Leber@law.njoag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New Jersey*

/s/ Bryan L. Bloom

Bryan L. Bloom  
Senior Enforcement Counsel  
New York State Office of the Attorney General  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone: (212) 416-8598  
Email: [Bryan.Bloom@ag.ny.gov](mailto:Bryan.Bloom@ag.ny.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New York*

/s/ Jeff Dan Herrera

Jeff Dan Herrera (*pro hac vice* pending)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Division  
New Mexico Department of Justice  
408 Galisteo St.  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
Telephone: (505) 490-4878  
Email: [JHerrera@nmdoj.gov](mailto:JHerrera@nmdoj.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of New Mexico*

/s/ Brian D. Rabinovitz

Brian D. Rabinovitz (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Special Deputy Attorney General  
North Carolina Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 629  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602  
Telephone: (919) 716-6000  
Facsimile: (919) 716-6050  
Email: [brabinovitz@ncdoj.gov](mailto:brabinovitz@ncdoj.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of North Carolina*

/s/ Sarah Mader

Sarah Mader (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Antitrust Section  
Office of the Ohio Attorney General  
30 E. Broad St., 26th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Telephone: (614) 466-4328  
Email: [Sarah.Mader@OhioAGO.gov](mailto:Sarah.Mader@OhioAGO.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Ohio*

/s/ Robert J. Carlson

Robert J. Carlson (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Unit  
Office of the Oklahoma Attorney General  
15 West 6th Street  
Suite 1000  
Tulsa, OK 74119  
Telephone: 918-581-2230  
Email: [robert.carlson@oag.ok.gov](mailto:robert.carlson@oag.ok.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oklahoma*

/s/ Gina Ko

Gina Ko (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Antitrust, False Claims, and Privacy Section  
Oregon Department of Justice  
100 SW Market St.,  
Portland, Oregon 97201  
Telephone: (971) 673-1880  
Fax: (503) 378-5017  
Email: [Gina.Ko@doj.oregon.gov](mailto:Gina.Ko@doj.oregon.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

/s/ Joseph S. Betsko

Joseph S. Betsko (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Antitrust Section  
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General  
Strawberry Square, 14th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
Telephone: (717) 787-4530  
Email: [jbetsko@attorneygeneral.gov](mailto:jbetsko@attorneygeneral.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*

/s/ Paul T.J. Meosky

Paul T.J. Meosky (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
Telephone: (401) 274-4400, ext. 2064  
Fax: (401) 222-2995  
Email: [pmeosky@riag.ri.gov](mailto:pmeosky@riag.ri.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island*

/s/ Danielle A. Robertson

Danielle A. Robertson (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General of South Carolina  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211  
Telephone: (803) 734-0274  
Email: [DaniRobertson@scag.gov](mailto:DaniRobertson@scag.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of South Carolina*

/s/ Bret Leigh Nance

Bret Leigh Nance (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
1302 E. Hwy 14, Suite 1  
Pierre SD 57501-8501  
Email: [bretleigh.nance@state.sd.us](mailto:bretleigh.nance@state.sd.us)  
Telephone: (605) 773-3215  
Bar # 5613  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of South Dakota*

/s/ Hamilton Millwee

Hamilton Millwee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General and Reporter  
P.O. Box 20207  
Nashville, TN 38202  
Telephone: (615) 291-5922  
Email: [Hamilton.Millwee@ag.tn.gov](mailto:Hamilton.Millwee@ag.tn.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Tennessee*

/s/ Diamante Smith

Diamante Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division  
Office of the Attorney General of Texas  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, TX 78711-2548  
Telephone: (512) 936-1162  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Texas*

/s/ Marie W.L. Martin

Marie W.L. Martin (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Deputy Division Director,  
Antitrust & Data Privacy Division  
Utah Office of Attorney General  
160 East 300 South, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 140830  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0830  
Telephone: 801-366-0375  
Email: [mwmartin@ag.utah.gov](mailto:mwmartin@ag.utah.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Utah*

/s/ Sarah L. J. Aceves

Sarah L. J. Aceves (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection and Antitrust Unit  
Vermont Attorney General's Office  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
Telephone: (802) 828-3170  
Email: [sarah.aceves@vermont.gov](mailto:sarah.aceves@vermont.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Vermont*

/s/ David C. Smith

David C. Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General of Virginia  
202 North 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Richmond, Virginia 23219  
Telephone: (804) 692-0588  
Facsimile: (804) 786-0122  
Email: [dsmith@oag.state.va.us](mailto:dsmith@oag.state.va.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Virginia*

/s/ Ashley A. Locke

Ashley A. Locke (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Antitrust Division  
Washington Office of the Attorney General  
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104-3188  
Telephone: (206) 389-2420  
Email: [Ashley.Locke@atg.wa.gov](mailto:Ashley.Locke@atg.wa.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Washington*

/s/ Douglas L. Davis

Douglas L. Davis (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection and Antitrust Section  
West Virginia Office of Attorney General  
P.O. Box 1789  
Charleston, WV 25326  
Telephone: (304) 558-8986  
Fax: (304) 558-0184  
Email: [douglas.l.davis@wvago.gov](mailto:douglas.l.davis@wvago.gov)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of West Virginia*

/s/ Laura E. McFarlane

Laura E. McFarlane (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
Assistant Attorney General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7857  
Madison, WI 53707-7857  
Telephone: (608) 266-8911  
Email: [mcfarlanele@doj.state.wi.us](mailto:mcfarlanele@doj.state.wi.us)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

/s/ William T. Young

William T. Young  
Assistant Attorney General  
Wyoming Attorney General's Office  
109 State Capitol  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
Telephone: (307) 777-7841  
Email: [william.young@wyo.gov](mailto:william.young@wyo.gov)  
*Attorney for the Plaintiff State of Wyoming*

## APPENDIX A

1. For each litigation custodian, please indicate:
  - a. the dates for which they received a legal hold for the (i) investigation, (ii) the litigation, and (iii) if the custodian was on any other legal hold since January 1, 2015, the dates of each additional legal hold.
  - b. the dates of all communications regarding legal holds in this case, including the communication (i) method, (ii) duration or length, and (iii) topics covered.
  - c. whether, when, and how each custodian was asked to (i) retain messages forever and (ii) refrain from deleting messages.
2. For each litigation custodian, please provide the actual legal holds, including transmittal date, for (i) the investigation, as applicable, (ii) the litigation, and (iii) any subsequent related communications.<sup>1</sup>
3. For each litigation custodian, please specify:
  - a. when their iMessage (or other equivalent) settings were set to keep messages “Forever”;
  - b. when and why any other retention settings (besides “Forever”) were enabled;
  - c. the timeframe(s) during which their texts were destroyed and the approximate number or volume of such texts; and
  - d. whether the custodian still has their iMessage (or other equivalent) settings set to “Forever” today.
4. For each litigation custodian, please list all messaging platforms used by that custodian for work (e.g., cellphone carrier messaging, Teams, Slack, WhatsApp, Zoom, social media platforms).
5. For each litigation custodian, please provide information sufficient to show the volume of text messages collected by month and year, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]
6. For each litigation custodian, the percentage of text messages Defendants determined were responsive as a proportion of the total text messages collected for that individual.
7. The TAR Protocol requires Defendants to create the Overall Universe of documents “[p]rior to the application of search terms” or the use of TAR. ECF 472-2, § II. Please

---

<sup>1</sup> While some courts have found legal hold notices to be privileged, such letters become discoverable when, as there is here, a preliminary showing of spoliation. See, e.g., *Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Roomster Corp.*, 2023 WL 4409484, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. June 1, 2023).

confirm the dates on which Defendants created the Overall Universe and the Primary and Secondary TAR Sets. Please indicate which categories of documents Defendants added to the Primary or Secondary TAR Sets after these dates, including how many documents were added, the types and sources of these documents, as well as when and why they were belatedly included.

8. Please list all documents by category that have not yet been ingested into the Primary or Secondary TAR Set and explain why that is the case for each document category.

9.

[REDACTED]

10.

[REDACTED]

11.

[REDACTED]

12. Please explain why priority custodial text messages from Mr. Rapino and Mr. Berchtold remain unproduced nearly two months after the substantial completion deadline.